1895-96
(L.R.)

File No. 107-95.
Serial No. 1-20.

Sub:- Appeal of Subramanya Somayaji Jodidar of Puttana Palya in the Kunigal Taluk regarding the boundary dispute.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1895-96.

191

(L. R.)

107-95

File No. ~~90~~

Serial Nos. 1—20

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1620

Major ~~Part~~ B for February 1901.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Subramanya Sonayaje, Joridar of Puttana Paliya in the Kunigal Taluk-re the Boundary dispute.

Indexed

99

countermarked

Office-Note.

MYSORE

Appeal No 82 of 1897-98.

Appellant:—
Subrahmanya Somayaji
Jodidar of Puttanpalya
Kunigal Taluk.

1) This is an appeal against the order of the Superintendent of Revenue Survey, declining to interfere with the boundary between Jodi Puttanpalya, and the Govt. village of Amritur, which ~~has been~~ was fixed in 1879 at the time of Survey of the latter village

2) The land which the appellant claims as belonging to his village forms part of the bed of the Amritur big tank, S. No 393, (the extent of is not given).

3) At the time of the Inam Settlement in 1870, the Surveyor attached to the Inam department fixed the boundaries of the Jodi village and took the Razinamas from the people of the adjoining villages, consenting to the boundaries fixed by him. On behalf of Amritur, Shanbhog Ramanna gave the Razinama, in which he simply states that the Revenue Surveyor fixed the boundary between Amritur and Puttapalya as shown by him.

4) Amritur was surveyed in 1879. The Survey Supdt reports that then the boundary of the village on the side of the appellants' village was fixed according to the old marks put up at the Inam enquiry, there being no necessity for obtaining a fresh

fresh Razinama for a boundary already defined, and that not even the slightest objection was made to the measurement then made.

(5) In 1896, Subbadarii and other Jodidars of the village addresses a petition to Govt praying for the introduction of Survey Settlement into their village. The petition was forwarded to the Survey Supdt for disposal. The Survey operations are stated to have been commenced, though not in 1897, though the sanction of Govt as does not appear to have been obtained under S. 236 of the Land Revenue Code.

(6) In December 1897, the appellant complained that the measurer included a portion of his village

lands in the adjoining Govt-
village of Amritsar, but the
Survey Supdt declined to interfere
chiefly on the ground that the
complaint was preferred long
after the boundary was settled.

7) The appellant has appealed
against the above order. His
contention is that in 1879, the
boundary was not fixed according
to the marks put up in 1870,
that he came to know of the
change only when Survey
operations were commenced in
his village in 1897, and that
the land in dispute has all along
been in his possession. In
support of his contention he
has produced what he calls
a copy of the Tippani of his
village prepared by the Revenue
Surveyor

T OF MYSORE

Surveyor at the time of Inam enquiry in 1870. The boundary line between the two villages as given in this differs from that given in the Survey map prepared in 1879. Appellant's prayer is that this line should be confirmed. But the original of the Tippani is not among the records of Inam enquiry, received from the Survey Supdt. The Appellant has also produced a sketch showing both the lines of boundary. But the Survey Supdt states that, in his opinion, it is entirely inaccurate. He also states that in the Sut-Pahani account ~~the block~~ no portion of the tank bed is shown to be under cultivation.

Column 9 (Boundary of Inam) of the Inamdars' Statement runs:

× of Puttanapalya

"In the East – Doddabetta

—"— West – Tank bed (ಒಕ್ಕಲಿದ್ದ) of Amritur Doddakere

—"— North – Doddahalla of Sondekoppa bringing water to Amritur tank from Doddabetta.

—"— South – Kodi, Boundary line of Agrahar –

Jodi village of Puttanapalya lies within these (boundaries). To this and to the surrounding villages there exists no boundary dispute, in support of ~~to~~ which fact Razinamas have been taken. Bondh stones have been fixed in accordance with the boundary."

N° 145-25/9/97

Paper 75.

Amildar's report on the boundary dispute, in reply to Yadi N° 841 of the 25/Supt's of Survey:

The ryots of Amritur having petitioned the Dy Collr urging that the bed of their tank alone belongs to them and not to Puttanapalya, Order N° 397 of 5-5-97 was given me by that Office. The ryots also sent an arzi to the Taluk on the same date. In obedience to the above order & to your Yadi, I personally went to the Village and not only inspected the disputed lands in presence of the parties but also examined the latter & their witnesses.

2. This file contains three Sketches: (1) the Sketch of the Mojanidar sent to you with his report in the beginning ie on 15-2-97,

× Paper (10)

(2) the ~~correct~~ sketch prepared by the Mojanidar on 9-8-97 in accordance with the Taluk Order, after the correct measurement of the takaran lands; & (3) that ~~sketch~~ prepared by the Jodidar on 22/8/97 showing the lands under cultivation &c. Of these The No. 1 Sketch of the Mojanidar does not seem to include the whole of the takaran lands; but the No. 2 sketch of his seems to ~~be perfect~~ include the whole of them. The latter moreover appears to have been compared with the Survey Tippani of the Inam Settlement of 1870. The sketch of the Jodidar corresponds to this and is also clear as it shows the portion of the bed of the Amirthavathi that shows belong to Puttanahalya, the lands that are under cultivation & those that are banjar &c. The portion under dispute is marked in this with a red ~~line~~ ink. Now the Jodidars state that

the

the lands up to the line A B C D E F G belong to them, while the villagers of Amritur contend that no lands this side the line A H E F I, which forms the bed of the tank, should go to the Jodidars. The extent under dispute measures ~~from~~ 22 & 30 guntas the cultivated and the banjar portions of which are clearly shown in the Mojanidar's second sketch.

3. According to the contention of the villagers of Amritur the whole of the tank-bed has been surveyed into their village, while it has been brought to notice that the disputed lands of the same bed were surveyed into the Jodi village (Puthanpalya) during the Inam Settlement. Of these two villages the Jodi village was surveyed

in 1870 and Amritur in 1879.

4. Shanbhoge Ramanna who has given a Rajinama in regard to the boundary of Amritur Village during Inam Survey states that the Rajinama refers to the boundary as fixed during the Revenue Survey of Amritur, and that it does not include the lands under dispute.

Cont The same Ramanna has in the written statement furnished to the Mojanidar on 7-4-97 Paper (7) i.e. after the detail Survey of the Godi Village was ordered stated that the lands in the bed of Amritur tank have long been cultivated by the Godidars and not newly, that he is ignorant how the mojani of Amritur took place, that the Godidars had been cultivating the lands in question even before the Survey settlement took place.

Thus

Thus, as this man is not consistent, in his ~~statements~~, his statements are unreliable

5. At present near the mark A of the sketch there are 2 boundary stones, at I 3 boundary stone and 1 stone, and at G 3 stones As shown in the sketch of Amritur no more boundary stones are to be seen to the east of this tank corresponding to the sketch of Amritur. They are said to have existed until last year and disappeared since, vide statements of the arzidars, & their witnesses* :- Shanbhoga Ramanna, Patel Venkatagowda, Nirganti Hombale Girigya, Pulle Gowda. But of these the 3rd witness, Shanbhoga Ramanna, in his said statement of 7.4.97, refers to above alleged ~~Sarathan~~ that no boundary stone

* ~~A~~ 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 7th & 8th witnesses

stones were ~~to be found~~ fixed at the time of survey in
the aforesaid ~~portion of lands~~ tract
and has thus contradicted himself.
The godidars, on the other hand,
say that no bounds or stones
were ever fixed to the east
(of the Amrutesi tank) as
marked in the annexed sketch.

6. With regard to the question
of enjoyment, the lands,
1/26, 2/25, 3/23, 4/24 of the sketch
have been declared alleged by the godidars to belong
to their village and to have been
under cultivation, & they
have cited as their witnesses
8 persons called the Sagunadidars
viz Marigoji, Sidda &c.
The 2?, 3?, 4", 5", 6", 7" & 8" witnesses
on the side of these and the
5th witness on that of the
Complainant state that they
have been cultivating these
respective lands from the beginning. × cossaway.
& that they have been keeping up to their old limits.
The 9th witness, Bova, on the
side of Arzidars states
that he has newly cultivated

year a portion of the said land $\frac{2}{25}$; So says Giriya (arzidars' 8th witness) in regard to land $\frac{3}{23}$; So says also Pulleyowda (arzidars' 7th witness) in regard to land $\frac{1}{26}$ which, the 1st witness on the side of Jodidars (Gowda gasada Timmegowda) states that he has also extended by cultivating. Besides, these persons have also stated that the extra cultivation was done with the ~~the order~~ permission ~~order~~ of the Jodidars. The Jodidars themselves declare, on their part, that all these lands have been from time immemorial under cultivation, and none of them were newly cultivated. That a grudge exists between the said 4 persons (Bova & others) and the Jodidars

becomes plain from the
records; for, the Jodidars
subjected them to a criminal
enquiry in Suit No 62 of
1896 on the file of the Genl Asst
Comr's Court, Junkur, on
a charge of theft of Soap-nut
in the Jodi village.

7. The Jodidars' accounts
were sent for and examined.
They show that the above
lands under dispute have
belonged to the Jodi village
and have been under culti
-vation since the year Jaya
or 1834. The Jodidars have
also shown, from their accounts
that the lands
5-6/32 had been formerly
given for ("Shatitu") culti-
vation, of mulberry leaves and
for Hulbanni. the rest
The Jodidars
have kept
kept the Saguvali Chitas
from 1834 to 1879-80 (Jaya - Ramadi),
of the Khelvar Khate, Khirdi
according to the form prescribed by the Survey Deptt.
Pahanis accounts, from

from 1880-81 (Vikrama).
Jari Inam land № 444 exists separately in the Jodi Village of Puttanapalya, and is held by Jodidar Subba Sastri. This land seems to extend a little towards the south into the bed of Amirtur lands. The said Subba Sastri has produced a copy of the statement given at the time of Inam Settlement, in which it is stated that the Southern boundary of this land is the dry land of Kala-gana hatti Timma which is understood to be № 1/26 of the sketch. Therefore it appears from this that Subba Sastri cultivated the lands bed long ago. Similarly it is understood that the remaining lands above referred to belonged to the Jodi Village from time immemorial, and formed its cultivated portion.

8. Of the lands mentioned in the sketch the triangle ZQG comprising an area of 14-14 guntas is liable to be submerged completely under water. If the tank gets the full supply of water, only a portion of the remaining land seems to submerge.

9. The bed of the tank is being sold annually for Hulbanni of the Sarcar Village of Amritur. According to the Survey Accounts of Jodi Kittana-kalya, the number of acres specified therein is entered in the Inam Title-deed. Had the Survey measurements of Amritur Village been conducted with reference to the Inam Survey held long before, there would have been no room for such talkarars.

10 The Jodidars have been directed to present themselves before you with the accounts of the Jodi Village and explain them to you; and the remaining papers are herewith forwarded.

31/12/98

Office note (Cont^d)

In docket No 5695 / P.F. 38-98 dt 20.2.99 the Supt^t of Rev. Survey was requested to forward to this Office a sketch of the village of Puttanapalya drawn by the Surveyor of the Inam Deptt in 1870, & to submit such remarks as may be called for on a comparison of the same with the sketch produced by the pet^r & with the survey map of the Amrita village.

× No 630 dt 15/3/99

In his reply the Supt^t states that no sketch by the Surveyor of the Inam Deptt of the boundary as fixed by Ranganna in 1870 can be found; that no comparison bet: it & the pet^r's sketch can consequently be instituted; that nevertheless the Surveyor of the Inam Deptt fixed the boundary marks which were found by the Survey Deptt when Amritur was measured in 1879; that, in his opinion there is no doubt that the

the cultivation now claimed by the Inamdar is recent, that is, subsequent to the Phut Pahani carried out prior to the introduction of the Settlement when no part of the tank bed was under cultivation; & that in the Inamdar's statement at the time of Inam enquiry the western boundary of Puttenahalya is said to be the Amritesa tank, ~~is~~ in the bed of which as defined by the Survey Dept. he (Inamdar) has deliberately & unauthorizedly cultivated.

A. R. Abbay

During the Survey settlement
of the village of Amrabati the
preliminary precaution of obtaining
a Nazeranama from the owners
of Joshi Bostan of Paliya was dispensed
with because the latter village
had been subjected to a regular
survey by the same Deptt in
1870 and the boundaries had
been fixed - The objection taken
on this score by the Petrs may
be overruled - But it is a case
which enables them to contend
that what was done at the Revenue
survey of the village of Amrabati
was not brought to their knowledge.
It does not appear that when
boundary marks were set up
which would give notice to the
appellants of any of their lands
having been included in the
neighbouring village of Amrabati.
It is not denied that the lands
in dispute which have been
measured to consist of 28.3 acres gontas
A G 22.30 were partly at least under cultivation
by or on behalf of
by the Jotidars of Bostan Paliya.

For these reasons it seems just & proper to give the Pltrs. an opportunity to be heard, and not dismiss their claim on the technical ground of being barred by the lapse of time.

The Jodidars rely mainly upon the fact that the Survey measurement is not in accordance with the Inam measurement. This fact is admitted by the Survey measurer himself and the further question depending upon it is what is the Inam measurement.

The boundary marks put upon the land have either disappeared or cannot indisputably be proved. There is no sketch forthcoming in the Inam Record and the S. Supt is not inclined to accept the correctness of the sketch produced by the Jodidars. There is no other specification of the land than the unauthenticated Kabane produced by the Jodidars. But in the Inam Record there is an abstract statement of the measurement which it is claimed has been installed by the Inam Settlement Supt Mr V. R. Narasimha Iyengar. This gives an abstract an area of 6 26 acres & 34 fonts

which tallies with the figures given in the so-called Ifrane book produced by the appellants. These have been marked now for purposes of identification A & B. It is not known what extent the present new survey gives the boundaries - It is clear that it ought not to be less than what A gives and this corresponds with B. The details will have yet to be worked out on this basis.

It is not easy to imagine the old accounts produced by the Boudiaas and the figures which have to be kept in view when considering them is whether the description given in them is sufficient to identify the lands in dispute. If they the entries refer to them the accounts must be received as corroborative evidence of occupation. It is not right to consider

In the position and circumstances of this case

the result of Poolbrahane's as
conclusive. The earth bed of
Amraler being one large number
of waste it is not improbable
that the Kolado Poolbrahane did
not extend both at all - The absence
of any mention in this account
of any mention of cultivation
on the edge of this large number
does not militate against the
claim of the Godeedars -

The record / maybe sent
back with the S. Supt with the
above observations for recon-
sideration and decision
on merits after such further local investigation
and examination of witnesses & accounts as may be
considered necessary - Unid.

To Dy Collr with record 31.8.99

Perhaps the
addressing
may advise the
Supt to consider
the present claim of
the applt untenable
he is requested to
submit a report upon

Dy 1/9/99 12101

I agree with the
above proposal
& may I should
with the few
slight additions noted
by me —

1.9.99

Revenue & 2nd Councillor
Dy 2/9/99

Rd 6.30 pm
2.9.99

Dy 6/9/99

Perhaps the order
& the order may
be revised

Unid
4.9.99

Rc 1896

No. 3896

Name of Petitioner, Sudha Sastri, Venkatasa Sastri, Nanjunda Sastri, and Jagannatha Sastri, Inamdars of

Village, Pattra Palya

Taluk, Hunigal Taluk

District, Tumkur

Date of Arzi, 4-6-96

Date of Receipt, 5-6-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Nil

ABSTRACT.

Petitioners state that—
They are Hissedars and uterine brothers. The Jodi village of Pattra Palya is in their joint possession and enjoyment. They are prepared to fix boundary stones on their holdings.

They pray that the provisions of Chapters 8 and 9 of the Land Revenue Code may be given effect to by the introduction of detail survey and settlement into their village and that the Ryots may be ordered to fix the boundary stones on their holdings at their own cost.

Submitted
as this petn be
transferred to Mr
Pitt, Rev Survey,
Despatch?
RC
11/6/96

Noted to Secy RC
9/6/96

Yes RC
11-6-96

RB
12/6/96

No. 3896

20-08-96

19-6-96

107 —

L-R. 20-95

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

~~REVENUE~~ DEPARTMENT,

dated 13th June 1896

Endorsement granted to Subbasastri & others,

Inamdars of Putua Palya village, Kunigal Taluk,

in reply to their Petition Registered No. 3896 dated 4th June 1896.

Petitioners ~~is~~ are informed that their petition, praying for the extension of the provisions of Chaps 8 and 9 of the L. R. Code, to their village, has been forwarded to the the Supdt. of Rev. Survey, for disposal.

13/6/96

"By Order"

13/6/96

~~Clerk~~ Secretary.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—6-3-94.—2000.

1896

From (3)

The Secretary to the

Government of Mysore.

L R 107-95-3

~~L R~~ Gl & Rev. Department

To The Superintendent of Rev. Survey in Mysore

Dated 13/6/96

Despatched 17

Received

General No. 1080

No. Q 4276.

Enclosure No.

Has the honor to forward for disposal, the accompanying petition, Regd. No 389 dated 4th June/96 from Subbadastru and others, Inamdars of Kutna Palya village, Kunigal Taluk, praying that the provisions of Chapters 8 and 9 of the L. R. Code, may be extended to their village.

By order

13/6/96

13/6/96 for Secretary

18/3/98

1898

No. 2303

Name of Petitioner Subramanya Somayaji

Village ~~Pattana Palya~~

Taluk Kunigal

District Tumkur

Date of Arzi 11-3-98

Date of Receipt 12-3-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 5

No,

Vers Records for refers

9/3/98

9 5 98

Recd 10th may 98

(1) 2 Rs Stamp affixed - Stamp Duty

(2) Survey Fists. order appealed against are dated 19.1.98 & 9.3.98 - Sr time

10/5/98

Sub 2 Weeks

The delay of one month & 18 days in the Records is too serious & cannot be excused. The Records could be traced without the date & month of the application referred to. Of course the head clerk in sending the petn for ref. has not shown the discretion expected of him, a mere application for a copy not being likely to elucidate matters in this case.

ABSTRACT

With reference to the petitio application to the Survey praying for a copy of Ra - mas Fields of Attur Village & Pattana Palya

Survey Superintendent his Endorsement No: 2 9-3-98 states that no of 1879 nama, as forth coming that the copy of the cannot be granted if he likes he may p appeal to that Of

13/5/98

The petitioner states that

Pattanna Palya has been
under the Enjoyment of the
petitioner & his ancestors,
that in accordance with the
Rajinama dated 20-7-79,
herewith submitted, the Moje
nidar sent by Mr. Narasimha
Iyengar, the Inam Asst Commr.,
for measuring the Village,
measured & fixed the boundaries
as shewn in sketch No I &
granted the petitioner a copy
of the sketch duly signed by
the Mojinidar, the original
being preserved in the file
now in the possession of the
Inam Supdt:- that on his
prosecuting to Govt: for the
detailed survey of his Village
Survey Supdt was directed
comply with his request &
was commenced about
January 1897- that in the
course of measuring it was
found that a portion of
Churable land as well as

his application cannot be traced as the exact date is not given & petn's name does not appear in the index for 96-97.
MK

included to Amraloor
Village in a subsequent
Survey carried on Jan 1879-
that thereupon the Majindar
reported to the Deputy Superintendent
-ent the difference, after
perusing the references
available with the petitioner,
that the petitioner likewise
noticed the difference between
the measurement of 1870 &
that of 1879- that the
Amildar after satisfying
himself that the lands
belonged to Jodi Puttana
Palya, directed the petitioner
to appear before the Survey
Supdt with the account
that the inhabitants
Amrutoor in the Melkote
Submitted an application
to the Survey Superintendent
on 12-9-97 representing that
the disputed lands belong

Amruttoor tank & Nos 6 &
the petitioner upon which
the Survey Supt directed the
on 17-9-97
Dy: Supt of Survey to complete
survey operations including
the disputed lands in the
map as belonging to Amruttoor,
that the petitioner begged the
Survey Superintendent to
peruse the reference in his
possession as well as the cor-
-respondence between the
Amildar & the Survey Dy: Supt
on the subject and pass equitable
orders, for which the Survey
Superintendent in his Endorse
ment No 8 of 19-1-98 informed
him that it could not be
allowed as the lands had
been added on to the water
spread area of Amruttoor
tank the same having
been unoccupied & laid
waste at the time of Survey in 1879

that the map had been pre-
-pared already in confor-
-mity with the Rajinamas
of both the Villages - that the
petitioner thereupon applies
to the Survey Supt& for copies
of the Rajinamas referred
to in his Endt: & No 8 of 19/1
in reply for which Endt:
No: 25 of 9-3-98 (abstracted
in the former part) was granted
that patta no: 446 of Bhata
Inamti of 1870 shows that
the lands to the South of it
was cultivated by Goriya -
& a copy of that statement
obtained from the Survey
Supt& is submitted alon
with the original file;
that this contradicts the
statements of the Survey
Supt& that the land was
included to Amrutoor
as it was lying waste

NB

Survey Superintendent in
fixing boundaries without
securing Rajinamas before
survey settlement is opposed
to Para 2 Section 16 of the Survey
Manual -
Prays that on perusal of
accounts in his possession
from ~~year~~ 1834 & 1897 &
other records connected
therewith orders may be
passed confirming the
Lands, which are in his possession
& Enjoyment, and marked
A.B.C.D.E.F.G in the Sketch no
II as belonging to Jodi
Puttaia Palya & not
as that belonging to Amootoor
as falsely pointed out
Survey of 1879

CL
13/98

Enclosures:-
1 Sketch no: II as per Survey of 1870

2. Sketch No: I

3. Survey Supdt's Endt: No:
8 dt 19-1-98

4 —do— do 25-dt 9-3/98

5. Rajinama dt 20-7-90

5 Enclosures.

14/3/98

PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. No 2303/R
DATE 12-3-98

10-3-98

ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಅಪೀಲು ನಂ. ೨೩೦೩/೯೮

ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರು — ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳು

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳು — ವಾದಿಗಳು

ಈ ಅಪೀಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅವರ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣಯ್ಯ ಅವರು ಹಾಜರಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅವರ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಶಂಕರ್ ಅವರು ಹಾಜರಾಗಿದ್ದರು.

1 ಈ ಅಪೀಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣಯ್ಯ ಅವರು ಹಾಜರಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅವರ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಶಂಕರ್ ಅವರು ಹಾಜರಾಗಿದ್ದರು.

2 ಈ ಅಪೀಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣಯ್ಯ ಅವರು ಹಾಜರಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅವರ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಶಂಕರ್ ಅವರು ಹಾಜರಾಗಿದ್ದರು.

ಆದೇಶ — ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣಯ್ಯ

ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. ಮತ್ತು ಹಿಸ್ಸಾ ನಂ.ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ 1 ಎಕರೆ 20 ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಚೀಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಲಭ್ಯವಿರುವ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಚೀಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳು ಬಾಕಿ ಇ

[illegible]

4. [illegible] 1897 [illegible]
[illegible] 12 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 17 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

5 [illegible]
[illegible] 1012 [illegible]
1897 [illegible] 13 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1879 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1898 [illegible]
[illegible] 19 [illegible] 8 [illegible]
[illegible]

6. [illegible]
[illegible] 8 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
1879 [illegible]
[illegible] 1898 [illegible]

ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಪೂರ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ-

7. ಕಡೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಶ್ಚಿಮಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಕಾಲುವೆಯ ಮೇಲಿಂದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನ ಮೇರೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಪಶ್ಚಿಮಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಪೂರ್ವಕ್ಕ

ಪಕ್ಷ ಪಕ್ಷಿ ಸಂಘಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವರು. ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ
ಸೇರಿದವರು ಹಂಪಿಯ ಶಿಲಾಶಾಸನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ
ಇವರು ಕ್ರಿ.ಶ 1870ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದರು ಹಿಂದು
ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದವರು. ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ
ಅಳಿಯಂದಿರು ಸೇರಿದವರು ಇವರು ಪ್ರಭಾವಿ
ಶಾಂತಿ 11ನೇ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ 1898ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನವು

Pet 1417 P2 (5) 23-5-98

LR 107-95-5

LR 70-95

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

No. 82 97-98

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition Registered No. 2303 dated 11-3-98 received at the Dewan's Office from Subramanya Lemayji C. Godi Puttana Palya in Kunigal Taluk, appealing against the order of the Survey Supte declining to grant copies of certain papers applied for by him

is forwarded, together with its five enclosures to the Superintendent of Rev. Survey in Mysore for a full report on the facts of the case and on the points urged in the petn.

2. The Survey Supte is further requested to report whether the land as represented by petr Lemayji has been introduced into his village

3. The return of the petn with enclosures is requested.

By order,

Dy or

Bangalore, 23/5/1898

for Secretary.

187 S/98

LQ 107-95-6

Gen. 30.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 5
JUL 2 - 1898
Pet 1
DEWAN'S OFFICE

1898

3

From The Supt. Mysore Rev Survey

To The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore.
Gen & Rev. Depts.

Dated 1st July 1898.
Despatched
Received

Enclosure No. 1 file

General No. 4
No.

In reply to No. Pet 1417 of 23rd June 1898.

SUBJECT

Submitting report re the appeal preferred by — Subramanya of Jodi — Puttanpalya Kunigal Taluk —

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office). Petition Records

Ref^s put up

Call for records in duty the Razinamas if available & a sketch of the land in dispute

14/7/98

14-7-98

4-7-98

4/7/98

P 4

Survey Superintendent's Office

Bangalore 30th June 1898

To

The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore, Rev & Dept

Sir

With reference to your official Memorandum No Rev 1417 dated 23rd May 1898 calling for a full report regarding the appeal preferred by Subramanaya Somayaji of Jadi Puttanapalya, Kunigal Taluk I have the honor to report as follows.

2 According to appellant's own statement, the boundary of his Jadi village Puttanapalya was fixed by the Surveyor attached to the Inam Department in the year 1870, in accordance

accordance with the Rajinama

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

given by the Shanbag of the ad-
joining Government village
Amanture and marks put up.

3 When the said Govt.
village Amanture was surveyed
in 1879, its boundary on the
side of the appellants village
was fixed according to old
marks put up at the Inam
Enquiry there being no
necessity for obtaining a
fresh Rajinama for a boun-
dary already defined.

4 The land in dispute
is included in the water-
spread of the tank belonging
to Government village Amanture

According

According to Phut Pahani accounts which were prepared by the Revenue authorities prior to the introduction of Survey Settlement, no portion of this tank was under cultivation. The appellant states that the land in dispute has always been under cultivation and this contention is not supported by the above record.

5 The appellant not having taken any steps since the Survey of the Govt. village in 1879 to correct the boundary of his village, if there was any

any irregularity, the Supdt. declined to reopen the question, after the lapse of 19 years, the appellants assertion that he discovered the mistake, lately during the detail Survey of his village being untenable.

6 The enclosures to the above Memorandum under reply are herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servant.

C Appanna
In charge Supts office

LR 107-95-7

1898

From

The Secretary to Govt
Land and Revenue

To

The Supdt of Rev Survey
Ke Lingore

81

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No. No. 411 & 15/7/98

No. P. 35 & 161

Enclosure No.

In returning herewith the plan and the enclosures received with his letter dated 1st July 1898 reporting on the appeal of Subramanya Somayaji of Jodi Pulaura Patty in the Tumkur Dist, for reference and re-submission has the honor to request that the entire records in the matter including the Rajinamas, if available may be sent back on early date together with a sketch of the land in dispute

By order

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

1284

1898

Pet 75

From

The Chief Survey Supdt

To

The Chief Secretary to the Govt
Dewan of Mysore.

Govt & Resd Despatches

Dated 18th August 1898

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. Vernacular correspondence

General No. 147.
No.

In reply to Docket sp 411 of 15th July 1898
F 35

SUBJECT.

Submitting correspondence regarding fixing the boundary between the villages of Amrdalu & Puttanpalya of the Kunigal Tk including the Rajjumans

References—(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Rd on 22/8/98 Resd Petitions 1898

Rep put up
All
3/8/98
Sd

24-8-98

Council Case: Sec 221 (g) of the Code.
Post for hearing & call for Maps from Survey Dept
27/8/98

Draft put up
Sen
27/8.

No 147

Survey Superintendents Office
Bangalore 18th August 1898

To The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Gl & Revenue Departts

Sir

In reply to your Docket No. 411/35
of the 15th July 1898, I have the honor
to forward the correspondence, as per
Tarist, which was recorded in the
Inam Superintendents Office, re-
-garding fixing the boundary
between the villages of Amatur
(Govt) and Puttan Palya (Jodi) of
the Kunigal Taluk, including the
Rajinamas alluded to.

2 No Rajinamas were taken when
the Government village was measured
in 1879 nor being necessary nor
was the slightest objection made to
the measurement then made. In
1881, at Pat Pahani, Survey No 293,
which

which is the Government Bank in
which the Jodidar of Puttanpaly
has been unauthorizedly cul-
-tivating, was testified to as
being entirely "Kharab" and no
mention whatever was made of
any cultivation.

3 The map submitted by
the Petitioner is in my opinion
entirely inaccurate. The line
A. B. C. D. E. F. G. is stated to be the
line fixed by the Inam Deputt
and very naturally fits in
exactly with the Inamdars en-
-croachments.

4 The Petition and enclosure
are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed Servant
J. D. Grant
Supt Ellapore Revenue
Survey

LR 107-95-9

1898

From The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore Revenue Dept.

To The Deputy Commr., Kunigal District

Dated 29th August 1898.

Despatched 29.

Received

General No. 1588. P

Pat No. 156

Enclosure No. W 1470 dt 18th August 1898 from the Tahsildar

Submitting the records relating to appeal of Subramanya Somayaji, Jodidar of Puttanpalya.

Has the honour to request that the village maps of Anuratur and Jodi Puttanpalya in the Kunigal Taluk, may be forwarded to this office for reference in connection with the appeal of referents Subramanya Somayaji, Jodidar of Puttanpalya regarding the boundary between Anuratur & Jodi Puttanpalya.

By Order

For Secretary

Draft

Bln.

27/8.

From

To

The Supdt, Mysore Revenue Survey
Bangalore

LR 107-95-10

Dated 19th November 1898

Despatched 19th November 1898

Received

General No. 3409 P

No. Rt-38 of 98

Enclosure No.

His docket No. 169 dated 2nd September 1898, forwarding certain village maps in connection with the appeal of Subrahmanya Somayaji regarding the boundary between Jodi Puttanpalya and Amritur in the Kunigal Taluk.

— " —

With reference to the above has the honour to request that the records referred to in the accompanying petition (No. 922) from Subrahmanya Somayaji may be forwarded to this office together

with the original of the
accompanying Tippani, produced by
the Petitioner, which he states, was prepared
at the time of the Inam enquiry
in 1870 by the Surveyor attached
to the Inam Department.

2. A very early reply is requested
as the appeal stands posted
to 5th Prox.

By Order

For Secretary.

Draft

Sd 19/11/98.

rec'd 1/12/98.

aft docket put up.

1/12/98.

Rec'd 5th Jan 1/12/98

Trans[n] of the Auditors long 2nd put up

[illegible] 3/12/98

LR107-95-11



(13)

General Serial No. 30.

1898.

From The Supt. Mysore Rev. Survey

To The ~~Secretary to the~~ Government of Mysore Gen & Rev Depts.

Dated
Despatched } 26th November 1898.
Received

Enclosures No. one book sent & sent.

General No. 358
No.

Secretary's Docket No 3409 Ref 738-98 dated 19th Instant

Has the honor to forward correspondence as per Terish together with Kacha map. No farther correspondence is to be found in the Inam Office.

Supt Mysore Rev. Survey

Rec'd 29/11

28/11/98

Consular Service No. 30.

1850

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures Nos.

Subject

No.

Imperial

189

From (14)

~~L. D. 00. 95~~

To The Supt: Inspr Revenue Survey

LR 107-95-12

Dated 1st

Despatched 1st Dec/98

Received

General No. 3902. P

P.T. No. 38-98

Enclosure No.

His docket No 358 dated 26th Nov: 98.

Has the honour to state that the enclosures of this office docket No 3409 / Pl: 38/98 have not been returned with the above and to request that the same may be returned so as to reach this office before the evening of the 3rd Inst:

By Order

Draft:

For Secretary.

Petn Appl
3/1712

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 3521
G 3 - 398
Petn 221
DEPOSIT OFFICE

General Serial No. 30.

(15)

1898.

LR107-95-13

From The Supt. Mysore Rev Survey

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Gen & Rev. Depts.

Dated

Despatched 2nd December 1898

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 373.
No.

Secretary's Docket No 3902 Pet: I.38-98 of 1st Instant.

Has the honor to return, as desired, the enclosures referred to in the above.

Supt. Mysore Rev Survey.

(16)

1899

From The Secretary to Govt of Mysore

To ~~The Superintendent~~ The Superintendent of Police & Ex-officio Chief Inspector of Explosives in Mysore.

Dated 20th
Despatched 21st } Feb'y '99

Received

(65)

General No. 5695. } 20-2-99
P.J. No. 38-98 }

Enclosure No.

LR 107-95-14

His clerket-No. 358 of 26th Nov'r '98 forwarding correspondence relating to the appeal of Subrahmanya Somayaji re the boundary between Jodi Puttanapalya & Aravitér, Kunigal Tk.

—a—

With reference to the above has the honour to request that he will be so good as to forward to this Office the sketch of the village of Puttana-

palya drawn by the
Surveyor of the Dram Dept
in 1870, and to submit such remarks as may be called for on a
Comparison of
the same with the ~~sketch~~ plan
sketch ~~to be found in~~ produced by the pet[r] and with the Survey map of the Amrutur village
~~the records herewith sent.~~

The village map of
Sondekoppa should also
be sent for reference in
the above case.

The records are
herewith sent for reference
and return

Bo

Dft

LR 107-95=1517

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

1899

Rs. 5700
Pet 351.

238 of 98 relating to the Subject is put up.

AK
17-3-99

From The Supt: Kingore Rly Survey

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Govt ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

LR 107-95

Dated 15th March 99

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 4. 1 Plan & 3 Statements

General No. 630
No.

In reply to Docket No 5695 of 20th Feb 1899. P.738-98

SUBJECT.

Submitting his remarks on the subject of the boundary between Jodi Pattanpalya and Amrathur, Kunigal Taluk

---

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Submitted to Asstry
18/3/99

Pet 4
16.3.99

To Council Clerk

The Sup[t] refers to the Shanabogs' Statements at the Inam Enquiry & the Plan relating to the subject. These shd be translated & entered on the Papers & returned thereto 25/3/99

Copy of the Shanabogs' statement found among Inam Settlement papers is translated & put up. 24/3/99

No 630

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 15th March 1899

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Rgl & Revenue Departts

Sir,

I have the honor, with reference to your Docket No. 5695 dated 20th R.T. 38-98 February 1899 on the subject of the Boundary between Jodi Puttanpalya and Amrutur Kunigal Taluk, to state that no sketch by the Surveyor of the Inam Department of the boundary as fixed by Rajinama in 1870 can be found, consequently no comparison between it and the

the boundary as shewn by the Petitioner can be instituted. How far the boundary as shewn by the Petitioner differs from the Survey map is at once obvious on the sketch produced by the Petitioner himself.

2 Although the Surveyor of the Imam Department left no sketch, if one was ever prepared at all, there can be no reasonable doubt that he fixed Boundary Marks and that the same were found by the Survey Department when the village of Amrature was measured in 1879.

3 In my opinion there is no doubt that the cultivation

now claimed by the Inamdar
is recent that is subsequent
to the Phut Pahani carried
out prior to the introduction
of the Settlement when no part
of the tank bed was under
cultivation. In the Inamdar's
statement at the time of Inam
enquiry, the western boundary
of Puttampalya is said to be
the Amrutsar tank in the bed
of which as defined by the
Survey Department he has de-
liberately and unauthorizedly
cultivated.

4 I forward as desired
a map of the village of Sonde-
Kappa.

5— The Records received with your Docket under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obed[t] Servant
J. P. Smyth
Supt[t] Mysore Revenue Survey

Sd/ C. S.
6-7-99.

Place in the file.

Sd/ V. R. T.
6/7/99.

Head Clerk
6/7/99

This file was subd to 2nd Councillor on 7/7/99.

Bbm
8/7.

2d 10.7.99
Subd to 2nd Councillor in Court.

11.7.99 These are cases to be the accounts of the pet[rs] for which I have files for the purpose of showing that the land in dispute has been cultivated by the pet[rs] for very many years. The pet[rs] also stated that these accounts had been produced before the amildar and inquiries had been made by him (amildar) had identified the land in dispute with the land mentioned in the accounts

Sd/ 11/7/99

Bbm. 30/m.
11.7.99.

1897.

No. 5-0.

Name of Petitioner Subramanya Somayaji

Village Jodi Kuttanapalya.

Taluk / Kunigal

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 5-7-99

Date of Receipt 6-7-99.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure One file.

ABSTRACT

States that when the present certain papers in the court on 3-7-99 during the hearing of his case, for reference, was asked to present the same before the Secy: with a Pharisat & that accordingly he has submitted certain papers with a list thereof.

Prays that the same may be gone through by passing judgment.

Sm
6/7/99.

MYSORE DEWAN'S
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REC'D. No. 50R
6-7-98

ಸನ್ನಿಧಾನ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಅರ್ಜಿ

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ

ಕಂಠಿಕಾ ಗ್ರಂಥಿ-ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿ (ಶ್ರೀ ಗಣಪತಿ ಸಚ್ಚಿದಾನಂದ ಭಟ್ಟರು ಕಂಡಂತೆ)

ಅಂತಃಸ್ರಾವಕ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಪ್ರಮುಖವಾದ ಗ್ರಂಥಿ ಇದು. ಇದು ಕಂಠದ ಮುಂಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ವಾಸನಾಳದ ಮೇಲ್ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಎರಡು ಹಾಲೆಗಳಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ್ದು ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಯೋಜಕ ಅಂಗಾಂಶವು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಜೋಡಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಆಕಾರ ಚಿಟ್ಟೆಯಂತೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಬಣ್ಣ ಕೆಂಪು ಕಂದು. ಇದರ ತೂಕ ಸುಮಾರು ೨೫ ಗ್ರಾಂ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಯೋಡಿನ್ ಅಂಶ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಥೈರಾಕ್ಸಿನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಟ್ರೈಅಯೋಡೋಥೈರೋನಿನ್ ಎಂಬ ಹಾರ್ಮೋನುಗಳು ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವುಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನಂತಿವೆ.

೧. ಇವು ಜೀವಕೋಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆಮ್ಲಜನಕದ ಬಳಕೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತವೆ.
೨. ಇವು ಪ್ರೋಟೀನ್, ಕೊಬ್ಬು ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಬೋಹೈಡ್ರೇಟ್‌ಗಳ ಚಯಾಪಚಯ ಕ್ರಿಯೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತವೆ.
೩. ಇವು ಮೂಳೆಗಳ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ.
೪. ಇವು ಮಾನಸಿಕ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ.
೫. ಇವು ಸಂತಾನೋತ್ಪತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ.
೬. ಇವು ಹೃದಯ ಬಡಿತವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತವೆ.
೭. ಇವು ಜೀರ್ಣಕ್ರಿಯೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತವೆ.
೮. ಇವು ಸ್ನಾಯುಗಳ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ.
೯. ಇವು ಚರ್ಮದ ಆರೋಗ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ.
೧೦. ಇವು ಕೂದಲಿನ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ.

ಈ ಹಾರ್ಮೋನುಗಳ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏರುಪೇರಾದಾಗ ಅನೇಕ ರೋಗಗಳು ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನಂತಿವೆ.

೧. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾದಾಗ ಉಂಟಾಗುವ ರೋಗಗಳು
೨. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾದಾಗ ಉಂಟಾಗುವ ರೋಗಗಳು
೩. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಗಡ್ಡೆಗಳು
೪. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಉರಿಯೂತ
೫. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಕ್ಯಾನ್ಸರ್

ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾದಾಗ ಉಂಟಾಗುವ ರೋಗಗಳು

೧. ಕ್ರೆಟಿನಿಸಂ
೨. ಮಿಕ್ಸೆಡಿಮಾ
೩. ಹೈಪೋಥೈರಾಯಿಡಿಸಂ
೪. ಗಾಯ್ಟರ್
೫. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡೈಟಿಸ್

ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾದಾಗ ಉಂಟಾಗುವ ರೋಗಗಳು

೧. ಗ್ರೇವ್ಸ್ ಕಾಯಿಲೆ
೨. ಥೈರೋಟಾಕ್ಸಿಕೋಸಿಸ್
೩. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗಡ್ಡೆಗಳು
೪. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಉರಿಯೂತ
೫. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಕ್ಯಾನ್ಸರ್

ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಗಡ್ಡೆಗಳು

೧. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗಡ್ಡೆಗಳು
೨. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಉರಿಯೂತ
೩. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಕ್ಯಾನ್ಸರ್

ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಉರಿಯೂತ

೧. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡೈಟಿಸ್
೨. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಕ್ಯಾನ್ಸರ್

ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಗ್ರಂಥಿಯ ಕ್ಯಾನ್ಸರ್

೧. ಥೈರಾಯಿಡ್ ಕ್ಯಾನ್ಸರ್

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಪಿಟಿಸಿಎಲ್/ಸಿಇ(ಟಿಪಿ)/ಎಸ್‌ಇ(ಟಿಪಿ)-೧/ಎಇಇ(ಟಿಪಿ)-೧/೨೦೨೨-೨೩/೭೨೬೭-೭೩

ಕಛೇರಿ ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಅಭಿಯಂತರರು (ವಿದ್ಯುತ್ ಪ್ರಸರಣ) ಕಾರ್ಯಪಾಲಕ ಅಭಿಯಂತರರ ಕಛೇರಿ ಆವರಣ, ೬೬/೧೧ ಕೆವಿ ಉಪಕೇಂದ್ರ ಆವರಣ, ಹಾಸನ ರಸ್ತೆ, ಚನ್ನರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಣ-೫೭೩೧೧೬

ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೨೭.೦೭.೨೦೨೨

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಸೂಚನೆ

ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಅರ್ಹ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರಿಂದ ಮೊಹರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಟೆಂಡರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧) ಹಾಸನ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ, ಚನ್ನರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಕಣಕಟ್ಟೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. ೧೨೨ರಲ್ಲಿ ೬೬/೧೧ ಕೆವಿ ಉಪಕೇಂದ್ರ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳು.

ಕೆಲಸದ ಹೆಸರು: ಹಾಸನ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ, ಚನ್ನರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಕಣಕಟ್ಟೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. ೧೨೨ರಲ್ಲಿ ೬೬/೧೧ ಕೆವಿ ಉಪಕೇಂದ್ರ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳು.

ಅಂದಾಜು ಮೊತ್ತ: ರೂ. ೨೭೫.೦೦ ಲಕ್ಷಗಳು

ಧರೋಹರ ಹಣ: ರೂ. ೫.೫೦ ಲಕ್ಷಗಳು

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಶುಲ್ಕ: ರೂ. ೫೦೦/-

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಮಾರಾಟ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೨೭.೦೭.೨೦೨೨ ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ೧೦.೦೦ ಗಂಟೆಯಿಂದ

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಮಾರಾಟ ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೦೩.೦೮.೨೦೨೨ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ೧೨.೦೦ ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೆ

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಸ್ವೀಕೃತಿ ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೦೩.೦೮.೨೦೨೨ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ೧೨.೩೦ ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೆ

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ತೆರೆಯುವ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೦೩.೦೮.೨೦೨೨ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ೧೨.೩೦ ಗಂಟೆಯ ನಂತರ

ಕಾಮಗಾರಿ ಪೂರ್ಣಗೊಳಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಧಿ: ೧೮ ತಿಂಗಳುಗಳು

ಷರತ್ತುಗಳು:

೧. ಟೆಂಡರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಕೆಪಿಟಿಸಿಎಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಂದಾಯಿತರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು.

೨. ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರು ಕಳೆದ ೫ ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ರೂ. ೧೫೦ ಲಕ್ಷಗಳ ಮೌಲ್ಯದ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಣಗೊಳಿಸಿರಬೇಕು.

೩. ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರು ಕಳೆದ ೩ ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಆದಾಯ ತೆರಿಗೆ ರಿಟರ್ನ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಆಡಿಟ್ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು.

೪. ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರು ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಪಾಲಿಸಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ವೇತನ ನೀಡಬೇಕು.

೫. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುರಕ್ಷತಾ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೬. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಪ್ರಗತಿಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿ ತಿಂಗಳು ಕಾರ್ಯಪಾಲಕ ಅಭಿಯಂತರರಿಗೆ ವರದಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

೭. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಗುಣಮಟ್ಟವು ಕೆಪಿಟಿಸಿಎಲ್ ನಿಯಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು.

೮. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಗದಂತೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

೯. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಬೆಳಕಿನ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

೧೦. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕುಡಿಯುವ ನೀರಿನ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

೧೧. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಶೌಚಾಲಯ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

೧೨. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅಗ್ನಿಶಾಮಕ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

೧೩. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಥಮ ಚಿಕಿತ್ಸಾ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

೧೪. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಂಚಾರ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

೧೫. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಪರಿಸರ ಸಂರಕ್ಷಣಾ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೧೬. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಶಬ್ದ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೧೭. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಧೂಳು ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೧೮. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ತ್ಯಾಜ್ಯ ನಿರ್ವಹಣಾ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೧೯. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಜಲ ಸಂರಕ್ಷಣಾ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೦. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಇಂಧನ ಸಂರಕ್ಷಣಾ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೧. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅರಣ್ಯೀಕರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೨. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಜೀವವೈವಿಧ್ಯ ಸಂರಕ್ಷಣಾ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೩. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಅರಣ್ಯೀಕರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೪. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕೃಷಿ ಅರಣ್ಯೀಕರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೫. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಪಾಳುಭೂಮಿ ಅರಣ್ಯೀಕರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೬. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಗಣಿಗಾರಿಕೆ ಅರಣ್ಯೀಕರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೭. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಅರಣ್ಯೀಕರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೮. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ನಗರ ಅರಣ್ಯೀಕರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨೯. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಗ್ರಾಮೀಣ ಅರಣ್ಯೀಕರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

೩೦. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಅರಣ್ಯೀಕರಣ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಸಹಿ/-
ಕಾರ್ಯಪಾಲಕ ಅಭಿಯಂತರರು (ವಿದ್ಯುತ್ ಪ್ರಸರಣ)
ಚನ್ನರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಣ

ಕ್ರ-2303 (17) 16-9-99

LR 107-95-17

ಸಿಟಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಇವರ ಆದೇಶ ದಿನಾಂಕ 11-3-98 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಮ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 2303 ಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಸ್ಥಳವನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸದರಿ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸಿ ಸಿಟಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂಲ ದಾವೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 1879 ಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ದಾವೆ ಹೂಡಿದ್ದು ಸದರಿ ದಾವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳವನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸಿಟಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಇವರು ಆದೇಶ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳವನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

Dated 13-9-29.

Draft-

B.J.

Hon Secretary

Proc. of the Govt. of Mysore
Appltt. Subrahmanya Somayaji

Read ~~1895~~ 1898

LR 107-95=18

Petition of appeal No 2303
A.S. 82
of 1897-98 presented by
Subrahmanya Somayaji, Jodidar
of Puttanapalya, Kunigal
taluk, against the order of
the Supdt. of Rev. Survey in
Mysore declining to interfere
with the boundary between
Jodi Puttanapalya and the
Govt. village of Amritenahalli as
fixed in 1879 when the
latter village was surveyed.

Endt. to Petr.
put up
R. 18/7/98

(2) Correspondence ending
with letter No. 630 dy 15th March
1899 from the Supdt. of Rev.
Survey in Mysore submitting
his

of the boundary of the aforesaid two villages.

(3) Records of the case.

P

Order thereon: No. 2343 P.J. 38-98 dt. 16.9.98.

(295)

During the Survey Settlement of the village of Amritter the preliminary precaution of obtaining a Razinama from the owners of Jodi Puttanepalya was dispensed with because the latter village had been subjected to a regular survey by the Inam Deptt in 1870 and the boundaries had been fixed. The objection taken on this score by the petr may be overruled. But it is a circumstance which enables him

them to contend that what-
was done at the Revenue
Survey of the village of
Anniter was not brought-
to his knowledge. It does
not appear that proper
boundary marks were
set up which would give
notice to the pattamdh of
any of his lands having
been included in the
neighbouring village of
Annaler. It is not denied
that the lands in dispute
which have been measured
to consist of 22 acres &
3 guntas were partly at-
least under cultivation
by or on behalf of the
Jodidars of Puttanapaly

not and proper to give the
appts
petn an opportunity to be heard,
& not dismiss their claim on
the technical ground of being
barred by the lapse of time.

The appts rely mainly & properly
upon the fact that the Survey
measurement is not in
accordance with the Inam
measurement. This fact
is admitted by the Survey
measurer himself, and
the further question depending
upon it is what is the Inam
measurement.

The boundary marks
put upon the land have
either disappeared or cannot
indisputably be proved.
There is no sketch forthcoming
in the Inam Record, and the

Survey

Survey Supt: is not in-
clined to accept the correct-
ness of the sketch produced
by the Jodidar. There is
no other specification of
the land than the unau-
thenticated Zipparé produced
by the Jodidar. But in
the Inam Record there is
an abstract statement
of the measurement which
it is believed has been
initialled by the then Inam
Asst Supt: Mr. V. R. Rama-
. Sreenivasa. This gives
in abstract an area of
626 acres + 34 guntas which
tallies with the figures
given in the so called
Zipparé Patti produced

by the appellants. These have been marked now for purposes of identification A + B. It is not known what extent the present Rev. Survey fixes the godidas. It is clear that it might not to be less than what A gives. and this corresponds with B. the details will have to be worked out on this basis.

It is not easy to impugn the old accounts produced by the godidars, and the question which has to be kept in view when considering them is whether the description given in them is sufficient to identify the lands in dispute. Of the entries

upon

refer to them the accounts must be received as corroborative evidence of enjoyment.

In the peculiar circumstances of the case it is not right to consider the result of Post Pahani as conclusive. The tank-bed of Amritur being one large number of waste it is not improbable that the Post Pahani did not extend to it at all. The absence of any mention in this account, of cultivation on the edge of this large number does not militate against the claim of the Zamindar.

The records are therefore sub

1923-24 ದಾಖಲೆ
16-9-99

sent back to the Supt. for ~~for~~ with the above observations for reconsideration and decision on merits after such further local investigation and examination of witnesses and accounts as may be considered necessary. If upon the additional enquiry now ordered the Supt. Rev. Survey, still considers the present claim of the applt untenable he is requested to submit a report to Govt.

Draft
C, C2

Secretary

To The Supt of Rev. Survey &c.
Mysore. With records & Village Maps

24.11.99

Dept 101-4-7

Gl. No. 3122
NOV. 3 1900
DEWAN

28

1900

From The Supt. Mysore
Trig. Survey.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
Dept. of Rev / Dept. J

Dated 31st October 1900
Despatched
Received

General No. 283
No.

Enclosure No. 1 Memo & Ker. File

In reply to Pro. No. 2343 of 16-9-99
P.J 58-98

SUBJECT

Reporting finally on the boundary dispute between Kuan village Puttanpalya and Government village Amritur of Kunigal Talak.

References
(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office)

P.J 38 of 98 relating to the Subject as put up

All
5/11/00

To Comm. Chief to Submit - Pro. No. 796 dy 15.10.1900 as put up.

6/11/00
Sd?

Blen
7/11/00.

Reported for hearing on the 13th inst. Issue notices.

Sd
8/11/00.

Mr. Surveyor's recommendation is accepted - and he will be requested to alter the maps as suggested.

Sd
13-11-00

18/12/1900

55 - Encs

Pro
2nd 3/11

Rs 5-11-00

No 283
Enclosures

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 31st October 1900.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Gen and Rev Depts.

Sir,

I have the honor, — with reference to Proceedings of Government Order No — 2343 / P.T. 35-98 dated 16th September 1899 on the subject of the appeal of the Jodidar of Puttan Palya Kunigal Tq. Taluk against my order declining to interfere — with the boundary betwee

that

that village and the village of Amrutur, to submit a Memorandum on the case by Special Assistant Mr. K. Ramaswami Iyengar which I trust will dispose of this vexatious case.

2 Keeping the various issues, as arranged by Mr K. Ramaswami Iyengar, in view, the following facts seem to be established.

1st The sketch map made by the Jodidar is incorrect and misleading, even if exhibits I and B are admitted, for the sake of argument, to be correct

as

as a matter of fact they are not correct. The total area of Puttanpalya as per A and B is — 626 acres 34 guntas and by detail Survey 673-a 33 guntas, consequently the Survey measurements in no way acted to the detriment of the Jodidar. Plots E. F. G, on dispute map attached to Memo-randum, were not in-cluded in the Inam measurements.

2nd The old accounts of Puttanpalya do not corroborate the claims — based

based on exhibits 1 and 2.

3rd. The finding under the 3rd issue is adverse to the Jodidar. The inference is that the boundary marks were never allowed to remain, until they were fixed in 1898. Evidence, both documentary and oral, establish that the Survey followed the demarcation by the Inam Department.

4th. The Pot Pahani Karkun, although this is not proved, may be strongly suspected to have done this work badly. This seems the only point in favour

of

of Jodidar.

5th The fact that the Paiki, or part old Numbers are continuations of the Paiki Numbers already measured into Puttanpalya does not by itself, affect the claim as there are no old or reliable Paimish accounts.

3 The opinion which I have formed upon this case, which has given infinite trouble, is that the only point which justifies some alteration of the present boundary is the fact that the Amanur tank is described as the western

boundary

boundary of the Inam — village. Consequently 5a 39 guntas, as shown by — Mr K. Ramaswami Iyengar's line of decision, may be included in the map of Puttanpalya. Plots E. F & G the Jodidar has no right to whatever.

4. On receipt of the order of Government I will — have the necessary alter- =ation made in the accounts of both villages.

5. The records in the case are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedt servant

Supt Mysore Rev: Survey

Before the Govt of Mysore

Appeal No: 82 of 1897-98

Present:- { P. N. Krishna Murti Esq, C.S.I.
and
V.P. Madhava Rao Esq, C.S.I.

Appellant:- Subramanya Somayaji
Jodidar of Puttanapalya,
Kunigal Taluk.

This is an appeal against the order of the Superintendent of Revenue Survey in Mysore, declining to interfere with the boundary between Jodi Puttanapalya and the Govt village of Amrutur, which was fixed in 1879 at the time of survey of the latter village.

The facts are:- The land which the appellant claims as belonging to his village forms part of the bed of the Amrutur big tank

S. No

CR 107-95-20

Above
There has been too long a delay in preparing this. This should have been avoided. Mrs
31/1/01

From Camp
4.2.01

S. no. 595. At the time of the Inam

Settlement in 1870, the Surveyor of the

Inam Department fixed the boundaries

of the Jodi village and took the Razi-

namas from the people of the adjoining

villages consenting to the boundaries

fixed by him. On behalf of Anuratur,

Shanbhog Ramanna gave the Razinama,

in which he simply states that the

Surveyor fixed the boundary between

Anuratur and Puttanapalya as shown

by him.

2. Anuratur was surveyed in

1879. The Survey Superintendent

to whom the appeal petition was forwarded for

report states that then the boundary of

the village on the side of Puttanapalya

was fixed according to the old

marks put up at the Inam enquiry,

there being no necessity for obtaining

a fresh Razinama for a boundary

already defined and that not even

the

the slightest objection was raised to the measurement then made.

3. In 1896, Subba Sastri and other Jodidars of the village addressed a petition to Govt, praying for the introduction of Survey Settlement into their village. The petition was forwarded to the Survey Supt for disposal. The survey operations are stated to have been commenced in 1897 though the sanction of Govt does not seem to have been obtained under Section 236 of the Land Revenue Code.

4. In December 1897 the appt complained that the measurer included a portion of his village lands in the adjoining Govt village of Amaravathy but the Survey Supt declined to interfere chiefly on the ground that the complaint was preferred long after

after the boundary was settled.

The apptt has preferred this appeal against the above order. He contends that in 1879 the boundary was not fixed according to the marks put up in 1870, that he came to know of the change only when the survey operations commenced in his village in ~~1879~~ 1897 and that the land in dispute has all along been in his possession. In support of his contention he has produced what he calls a copy of the tippani of his village alleged to have been prepared by the Surveyor at the time of the Inam Enquiry in 1870. The boundary line between the two villages as given in this differs from that given in the Survey map prepared in 1879. The appellant's prayer is that this line should be confirmed.

5. After hearing the appellant the Govt ~~proceeded to the case to the Secretary~~ in

in Pro: No. 2343 / P.F. 38-98 & 16.9.99,

remanded the case to the Survey Supt for reconsideration and decision on merits after such further local investigation and examination of witnesses and accounts as might be considered necessary, or for a report to Govt. if upon the additional enquiry ordered the Supt of Revn Survey still considered the claim of the appellant untenable.

6. The Survey Supt now submits a memorandum of the case prepared by Special Assistant Mr K. Ramaswami Iyengar, who was deputed to enquire into the matter, and proposes that an extent of A 5-39 Q. 8 P ~~as shown in Mr. K. Ramaswami Iyengar's line of decision~~ 8 P may be included in Puttanapalya, the Jodidar (applt) having no right whatever to the other portions claimed by him.

7. The Survey Supt's

recommendation

recommendation is accepted and

he is requested to alter the

village maps vea according.

31/1/01.

Secretary

e,+l₂

Draft

BBr

31/1/01.

(1013)

No. 5790 Dt 6/2/01.

Pol. B. 38-98

To The Supt of Revenue Survey in Jaypore with records & maps.